

FABIAN QUARTERLY

No 30

SUMMER

1941

	Page
Fabian Research: Quarterly Report .. -	2
After a Year of Coalition - - - -	5
Transport and the War - - - -	10
Saving and Spending - - - -	15
A Gap in Workmen's Compensation - -	20
Post-War Reconstruction and the Press -	24
Notes on Books - - - .. - -	29

FABIAN

11 Dartmouth St



SOCIETY

London SW 1

FABIAN RESEARCH

Quarterly Report

GENERAL RESEARCH

Regular quarterly résumés of the work of the Research Department become tedious to read—and rather tedious to write. This Quarter there seems little need for a detailed review as one is published in the Annual Report, and the research position does not change so rapidly as to be completely different in a month. Meanwhile some old and many new Fabians may be interested in a general answer to the questions so frequently asked, ‘How do you organise research? What does it lead to anyhow? How could I help?’

Ideas for subjects for books and pamphlets arise variously; sometimes it is obvious that a subject is both topical and of long-term importance, e.g. Evacuation, Social Security; sometimes an expert can be persuaded to write something authoritative on his own subject; sometimes a service is so much criticised that we look round for somebody to find out what the situation really is—that is why a tract is now being prepared on London’s A R P Services. Once topics and authors are decided on we rely on innumerable Fabians for introductions, for pieces of accurate local information, for suggestions and comments.

Not all Fabian research results in books or pamphlets or *Quarterly* articles. Some is published in the Press, some is the basis of questions in Parliament, some involves letters to Government Departments or in conversations in high places. All informed Fabian letters and documents are filed to form the nucleus of future work, and to be consulted by Fabian speakers and writers. We are always glad to know of members with specialised knowledge which we can tap when necessary. Almost any ability can be turned to good account by the Research Department. For example one Fabian offers her comptometer for the Society’s work, another will look up special data in the scientific library where she works; a librarian is compiling a series of bibliographies for the use of members, and another helper types in her own home.

Always we depend on members for ideas, and that is the starting-point at which members can help. Work out your ideas and then send them to us. One good idea came recently from a member who complained that she had not seen in London those services which she had visited in foreign cities. As a result we are

arranging a series of 'Visits of Observation' on September Saturday afternoons. Details will be announced in *Fabian News*.

Work in Hand

BOOKS :

Social Security ; Coordination and reconstruction of the cash-paying social services.

Education : Labour Policy for Post-Primary Education.

Trade Associations by Professor Hermann Levy.

PAMPHLETS ON :

Fish ; London's A R P Services ; Education of Backward Children ; Feeding-stuffs ; Local Government Regions ; Communal Feeding ; Electricity Supply ; Nursery Schools.

MISCELLANEOUS :

Architectural education ; Youth organisations ; The staffing of the Assistance Services ; Wartime changes in Local Government ; Canned Food.

COLONIAL BUREAU

The day to day work of keeping in touch with events in the colonies and bringing these events to the attention of the public in this country continues to occupy most of the time of the Bureau. A serious handicap was imposed by the destruction of one of the most valuable London libraries containing a unique collection of empire books and papers, but this handicap is being partly overcome by the receipt of more and more first-hand material direct from the colonies, as the Bureau becomes better known throughout the Empire. The task of providing material to the press and interested members of Parliament is being carried on very satisfactorily. The broader public is being approached by the publication of the Bureau's journal *Empire*, the first number of which appeared in May. The Bureau is holding a conference on colonial affairs in Oxford in July, at which it is also hoped that events in the colonies will be brought to the attention of a wider public.

The growing mass of information which is being collected is being carefully filed and indexed, and is becoming of considerable value to all interested in current colonial affairs.

In addition to this day to day work, the Bureau is sponsoring three research projects. The first is a book on the economic development of the African colonies, *Plan for Africa*, by the secretary, Rita Hinden. This book has been accepted for publication and is now being printed. The second is a series of essays on various aspects of colonial policy—health, education, labour, policy, etc.—

written by a team of experts and edited by Leonard Woolf. The third project is the inquiry into the production and marketing of primary products, which is being undertaken by about ten research workers, under the leadership of P. Lamartine Yates. The publication of one or two popular factual pamphlets on the colonies is now also under consideration.

INTERNATIONAL BUREAU

The International Bureau was started this Spring to deal with questions affecting our policy towards other nations, now and after the war. A good start was made with the formation of a committee of European Socialists, which includes prominent leaders from nine leading European countries, under the chairmanship of Philip Noel-Baker. The committee has started work on a book, in which, after investigation of the causes of the breakdown of democracy in Europe and the outbreak of the present war, schemes and proposals for a Socialist Europe after the war will be put forward. The great merit of this work, it is hoped, will be that it will supply an outline of policy agreed on by Socialists from a number of European countries, and not worked out from a purely British angle. (We hope that it will be ready by the autumn.)

A survey of British propaganda broadcasts to foreign countries has also been undertaken, and some very valuable reports are coming in. The 'MoI crisis' is not the only symptom indicating that all is not well with our propaganda services, as many people will realise, and we feel that the work of this survey is really important.

Some interesting work has been begun in exploring our relations with various national groups and in particular the question of the official British attitude towards Spain has elicited some very useful material. It is hoped shortly to start study groups dealing with specific aspects of the detailed application of Labour's Peace Aims. Particulars will be announced in *Fabian News* and those interested are invited to offer their collaboration. We have also set up a panel of speakers, on which a large number of foreign Socialists have agreed to serve, and several have already addressed meetings in or near London. It is unfortunately more difficult to supply speakers to groups and societies in the Provinces, though a number are available in different areas.

AFTER A YEAR OF COALITION

John Parker MP

Now that more than a year has passed since the Labour Party entered the Government it is a convenient moment to review its achievements. The Party Conference at London showed that there is no relaxation in the Party's determination to carry through the struggle against Hitler to a decisive and successful conclusion ; last year's decisions were emphatically re-endorsed. In fact, lack of opposition to the Executive's view on this policy made the Conference somewhat dull. The Conference did, however, reveal certain misgivings within the Party as to how far the Party was pulling its full weight within the Government, especially in dealing with the vested interests which are obstructing the war effort.

Critics of the Labour Party, particularly those from the Left, usually underestimate the importance of Labour's influence upon the Government's actions and legislation in the past year. The striking thing about Labour's influence in this period, however, is that it has been limited very largely to the sphere of social reform. This is due to a number of factors, the most important of these being that pressure from rank and file members of the Party and from constituents upon Labour M P s has come almost exclusively on bread and butter questions. This pressure, which is normal in peace time, has been increased by war conditions, when enemy action provides many citizens with personal difficulties and grievances to take up with their M P s.

THE PARLIAMENTARY PARTY AND SOCIAL REFORM

One of the most interesting developments in the political field since the outbreak of the war, and in particular since Labour went into the Government, has been the change in importance of the weekly meetings of the Parliamentary Labour Party. In peace time such meetings were very largely of a business character. Discussions took place on what was coming up the following week in the House and decisions were taken as to the line the Party should adopt and who should be its main speakers. In recent months the Party Meeting has taken on a different character. Attlee and the leading members of the Party in the Government frequently attend, either to explain Government policy, to answer questions,

or to listen to the views and representations of the Party. It has been very largely by this machinery that the Party has initiated legislation in connection with the various social reforms which have taken place. For example, M P s at the Party Meeting expressed the strong feelings of their constituents about the Means Test and made it quite clear that they expected an alteration in policy from the Government. Attlee listened to these representations, took them to the Cabinet and obtained agreement that some change should be carried through; he then returned to the Party, which set up a small committee to go into the matter and put forward constructive suggestions for reform. Negotiations then took place between Ministers and the Party, which finally produced very considerable alterations, giving the Labour Party substantially 90% of what it asked. In a somewhat similar way the Party pressed for and obtained changes in allowances for the families and dependants of serving men, an increase in old age pensions and alterations in unemployment insurance, health insurance, workmen's compensation, war pensions, etc. Certain other social changes of great importance have resulted from Ernest Bevin's imaginative way of dealing with the problem of mobilisation of labour in support of the war effort. The eradication of casual labour for dockers, seamen and miners, and the creation of a large full time army of building workers are bound to have far-reaching results. For it is very unlikely that the workers in these various industries will ever agree to go back to pre-war conditions; to maintain this new method of organising labour forces after the war some drastic reorganisation of the industries concerned will be necessary. Another important reason why progress has been more rapid in the sphere of social reform than elsewhere is that Tories find it much easier to make concessions in this field than in others where greater questions of principle are involved.

ECONOMIC AND FOREIGN POLICY

The chief criticism that can be advanced against the Labour Party since its entry into the Government is that it has had relatively small influence upon the Government's economic and foreign policies. One of the principal reasons for this is that in contrast to bread and butter matters there is very little pressure from constituents and rank and file members of the Party on such questions, save from a few unrepresentative extremists. The result is that relatively little attention is paid to these matters at Parliamentary Party Meetings. It is true that the maintenance of the national morale requires urgent attention to wartime grievances as they arise, but neglect of these other fields may have equally disastrous results in

undermining the war effort, in prolonging the war and in losing the peace.

GROWTH OF A CORPORATE ECONOMY

One of the most serious developments in industrial organisation since the outbreak of the war has been the creation of various controls for raw materials and foodstuffs which are in most cases dominated by the biggest firms in that particular branch of trade. Sometimes the businessmen who have been thus transferred to Government service draw a Government salary; sometimes they are 'dollar a year' men doing the work for love! In both cases they are supposed to sever their previous business connections. However public spirited such men may be, it is very difficult to believe that their actions can in all cases be freed from a bias due to previous experience.

We know that as a result of the controls established during the last war various monopolies, such as United Dairies and Imperial Chemicals, came into being. The rapid growth of monopolistic tendencies since the last war, in conjunction with the closing down of firms by the Board of Trade in the non-essential industries in this war, make it only too likely that the end of the war will find strong monopolies entrenched in most industries in the country. Socialists need to wake up to the great danger to democratic government which such a development must necessarily produce. At the present time the Party should be approaching this problem from three angles. In the first place they should be endeavouring to have the controls reconstructed as to personnel, so that the key positions in the controls are held by persons who have had no previous connections with the vested interests concerned. In the second place, wherever wartime needs have made radical reorganisation of a particular trade necessary they should be advocating full national ownership accompanied by drastic reorganisation. In the third place the Party's propaganda in the country should be concentrating upon the need for seeing that the industrial monopolies which present economic trends make essential are run in the interests of the people as a whole and not in the interests of a few. These recent developments make a stronger case for socialism than has existed for many years. Advantage should be taken of this situation to put forward the socialist case in a fresh and clear way. Personally I am quite certain that once this problem is fully understood the great mass of the intelligent and interested electorate will rally to support the socialist case.

What kind of action has so far been taken on these matters? One or two of the controls, such as the timber control, have been

reorganised on such lines, but the great mass are still untouched. Nationalisation of transport is becoming a live issue. For there has been growing pressure on this question from London M P s whose constituents have suffered particularly acutely from transport difficulties during the blitz, from M P s connected with the various transport unions and from those whose attention has been aroused by shipping problems and the difficulties in connection with distribution of coal and other raw materials. This has found expression at meetings of the Parliamentary Party, but so far no progress appears to have been made towards carrying through the necessary scheme for the coordination and reorganisation of transport under national ownership. In no other industry is nationalisation under serious consideration by the movement at the present time; the miners for example have for the moment actually dropped any demand for nationalisation as a way of dealing with wartime problems.

It may be claimed that to press for socialistic measures in wartime is to take advantage of the war situation in the interests of party politics. The full reply to such a claim is that unless the Party keeps its end up in this matter the vested interests will undoubtedly take advantage of the war situation to get fully entrenched in positions from which it will be very difficult to remove them when the war is over. It is up to the politically interested members of the rank and file of the Party to bring pressure upon their M P s and leaders so that they are kept constantly aware of this danger.

TORY CONTROL OF FOREIGN PROPAGANDA

The other important field in which the effect of Labour's entry in the Government requires to be considered is that of foreign policy. Mr. Eden has received Labour backing in some of the more progressive statements he has made and the Party can undoubtedly claim a considerable measure of responsibility for the recently announced changes in the recruitment of the Diplomatic Service, but by and large it must be admitted that the Tories have kept a remarkably strong hold on this field of national policy. The Prime Minister has steadily refused to issue any statement on war aims, despite the plea of the *Daily Herald* and of a number of Labour M P s that such a statement would be of substantial assistance to our war effort in helping to rally the various peoples of Europe and the World to our side in the struggle against Hitler. The Party made clear its own position on this question at a very early stage of the war. In recent months pressure upon the Government for such a statement has unfortunately slackened off somewhat owing

to the fact that the small group of pacifist M P s have largely made a corner in this subject and have thereby helped to discredit the campaign in favour of a Government statement! For a long time disquiet has been felt by those interested at the character of the propaganda, particularly in the sphere of broadcasting, which this country has been putting over to foreign countries. Criticism has grown steadily and some improvement has resulted, but there is still need for a complete overhaul of our foreign propaganda. It is difficult to see, however, how an effective line in propaganda can be put over until the Government has made quite clear what its war aims are. Contacts have grown up in recent months between active Socialists in this country and our foreign comrades who have come to this country from abroad. As a result, action is now beginning to be taken to see that greater use is made of our foreign comrades in connection with propaganda abroad. In the whole of this sphere of foreign policy the party must exert a much greater influence if a progressive foreign policy is to be carried out by the Government and greater thought must be given to the question of international post-war reconstruction if a lasting peace is to be obtained.

In home propaganda, too, it is obvious that the balance of control has been weighted heavily on the Tory side. The Party is now pressing for an additional Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Information from the Labour Party, who if appointed should be able to correct this to some extent. The agreement with the Tory 1922 Committee enabling M P's to ban any Ministry speaker in their constituencies is also palpably inequitable with over 400 Tory M P's sitting on the strength of a 1935 election trick.

In the last few weeks I have been privileged to attend a number of discussions which have taken place amongst various prominent foreign socialists in this country. These have dealt with the reasons for the collapse of democracy and of the socialist movements in Europe and have led on to consideration of how to build up the kind of world we want when the war is over. The point which has particularly struck me is that Socialists from all countries take the view that their parties gave too much consideration to questions of social reform compared with those of industrial power and organisation and of foreign policy. It is to be hoped that the politically active members of our own Party will learn from foreign experience and will see that pressure is put upon Labour members of the Government in the coming months not to restrict themselves to the sphere of social reform in the actions which they press the Government to take.

TRANSPORT AND THE WAR

F. C. Watkins MP

British transport services have creditably withstood the strain and danger of war. No praise could be too high for the splendid way in which railway workers of all grades have met the difficulties of the wartime situation. Railwaymen have sometimes had to do their work under the most terrifying conditions. The long black-out during the winter months, and heavy air bombardment on vulnerable transport centres where large numbers of men are employed, have not had the effect of seriously interrupting or interfering with railway services. The signalman alone in his box, the driver and fireman on the footplate, and the shunter in the blackened yard, as well as clerks, controllers and station-masters, have carried on amid all dangers. Yet having recorded all that, I know that there have been many complaints levelled against both passenger and goods services. Some of these complaints arise from defects caused by enemy bombing, but much criticism arises from faults and delays originating in the antiquated and unscientific system of transport organisation that now operates.

Adequate, punctual and efficient transport is important in normal times for the life and well-being of the community. It is of supreme importance in times of war. In total war, each section of the British national effort is pitted against the corresponding section of the Germans. Our fighting forces are ranged against theirs; our factories against their factories; our system of transport against their system. We need to be as strong or stronger in transport than they are. We must have all our transport work done with the maximum efficiency, for if our services are dilatory or insufficient our net war effort must be retarded. I am convinced that by better organisation in these critical days our transport services could be greatly improved. In most of the war industries, vast changes have been made in order to increase output. The transport industry remains much in its pre-war form. Although on 1 September 1939 the Government assumed control of British railways, no radical change has been made in the methods of operating them. The separate Companies, each with its own distinct method, remain. The road services are not coordinated among themselves, nor are they linked to the railways.

THE RAILWAY AGREEMENT

The Government gave the transport situation a wrong angle at the beginning of the war. They took control of the four main line Companies and the London Passenger Transport Board, but they left these five undertakings intact, each with its own board of directors and individual working arrangements. All the receipts arising from their operations were to be pooled, and subsequently apportioned between them on the basis contained in the White Paper of 1940. The Railway Executive Committee were appointed, consisting of a chairman, Sir Ralph Wedgwood, the retired General Manager of the L N E R, plus the General Managers of the Great Western, Southern and L & N E Companies, the Vice President of the L M S Company, and Lord Ashfield of the L P T B. Each of these, excluding the chairman, retained his post in his own undertaking, though at intervals they met as a national executive to administer the railway business from a general point of view. These six officials are all of them exceedingly competent, and no criticism is levelled against them on grounds of ability. They are first-class railwaymen of great experience and knowledge. But, in the nature of things, each one of them, apart from the chairman, must have found it almost impossible to break away from the habits and outlook of a lifetime spent in the service of his own undertaking, especially as there was nothing in the Government's arrangement to preclude them from thinking they would revert to their posts in their separate privately-owned undertakings at the end of the war. They were placed in a very difficult position. They were expected to be loyal to their own boards of directors and shareholders, and at the same time to serve the wider interest of national transport. A system of control on such a basis is farcical. To the original Railway Executive Committee, Lt Col Moore Brabazon recently appointed an additional member, Mr G. Szlumper, a Southern Railway Company's official, who had been seconded to the Ministry of Transport. That small change in the personnel does not, I think, weaken my contention.

The White Paper was very strongly and rightly attacked for its provision which required the Minister of Transport to authorise at quarterly intervals increases in railway charges to meet increased costs due to war conditions. An arrangement which ensured that the railways could pass on to the public additional war costs quite irrespective of extra profit arising from increased war traffic was vexatious and indefensible. I hope it may be regarded as improbable that this arrangement will be operated in the future.

In my judgment the financial provisions of the White Paper did not provide the railways with an unduly lavish remuneration

for the shareholders, but they appeared to do so, and the Press was not too careful in its handling of this aspect of the matter. The Government guarantee of £40,000,000 annual net revenue was a valueless provision for the railways, for it is almost unthinkable that under war conditions the net revenue would fail to reach that amount. The White Paper guarantee will cost the Government nothing.

NEW MEN, NEW MEASURES ?

Lately there have been rumours and indications of an intention on the part of the Government to revise the agreement, and to organise the industry more thoroughly for war. Some of the speeches of Lt Col Moore Brabazon, the ex-Minister of Transport, could be so interpreted. He said recently that he was trying to make the four railways work as one. He found, he said, that the four, while ready to fight together against the world, were still ready to fight to the death against one another. Many of us hoped that he was about to take in hand the supremely important task of coordinating not only the railways but all the transport services of the country. However, we must look to his successor, Lord Leathers, who is now in control of transport and shipping, in the newly formed Ministry. Lord Leathers, a newcomer into the world of politics, was a director of many coal and shipping companies. He has now a great opportunity of doing a much needed job of work. It is to be hoped that the new Minister's long service in the world of shipping will not lead him to concentrate exclusively on that side of his Ministry, but that he will give at once full consideration to the needs of inland transport.

The new Ministry of War Transport is of tremendous importance to the war effort. Hitherto there has been some dislocation at the ports due to ships and their cargoes being the responsibility of one Ministry, and the transportation of those cargoes away from the docks the responsibility of another. Now that one Ministry is responsible for all the transport operations from the loading of cargo in oversea ports to the delivery of that cargo to the British consumers, much greater smoothness of working should be secured. The chain of operations should now be properly articulated and delay avoided.

UNIFICATION

In the railway world, there ought not to be *four* group companies. The quadruplicate organisation is a serious handicap to transport efficiency. The institution of the four group system by the Railways Act of 1921 was never regarded by experienced

observers as anything more than a temporary piece of organisation—a halting ground before we moved on again to complete unification. We need a single instrument of railway organisation in place of an arrangement in which four groups merely pretend to work as though they were united through the medium of a Railway Executive Committee. The situation calls on the railway side for complete unification under public control. Suspicion, intrigue, jealousy and an undue desire to preserve and protect separate interests would be immediately eliminated, as they ought to be wherever they exist, for they are in conflict with the national purpose. But the present position clamours for something even more drastic than that.

Transport to-day is a vital service. In this hour of the nation's greatest need, it is of vital importance that the docks should be cleared quickly, that our war industries should be served punctually and swiftly, and that in the increasing tempo of the war effort transport should be geared to the accelerating national programme of production. I am certain that the railways, given the right organisation, can achieve all that is required of them. Properly directed, the management and the staff possess all the technical skill and operating ability to fully satisfy the nation's demands. But for this purpose, transport as a whole, rail and road, should be transformed into a single unified organisation. Only thus can the industry in the present critical situation be effectively harnessed to the national effort for victory.

A NATIONAL TRANSPORT BOARD

There should be instituted, under the Minister of War Transport, a National Transport Board, consisting not of representatives of varied transport interests, but of single-minded men whose only responsibility is the efficient management of all railways, large-scale road concerns, the canals, and coast-wise shipping organisations. Unification and inter-locking are essential. Each category of transport must be made complementary to the others. Road services must feed and dovetail into rail services, and coast-wise shipping, wherever practicable, utilised to the full to relieve the strain on land transport.

The road transport industry is unorganised, and the proper functioning of it presents a difficult problem, but its very complexity arises out of its uncontrolled and disorganised condition, which is the measure of the urgent need for solving it. It is absurd in wartime to permit the numerous private firms which own and control such a vital element to do what they like with it. The ownership of vehicles is in so many hands that a complete planned

consolidation could not be effected immediately. There are, however, large concerns which could and should be organised into the national scheme. For passenger and goods services these important undertakings are operating individualistically. Their operations would be much more useful to the community if they were included in a comprehensive national plan.

IMMEDIATE STEPS

I suggest that for the period of the war the Minister of War Transport should gain control of transport by the simple expedient of hiring the required undertakings on a fair and reasonable annual rental charge. This would provide a temporary wartime method of compensation. At the end of the war emergency the terms of compensation for the permanent acquisition of the undertakings could be determined. By this arrangement an immediate commencement could be made on the work of knitting together all the varied forms of transport into a coordinated national scheme, and all the complications inherent in calculating the scale of compensation would be postponed until the stress of the war was over. But it is essential that the Government should make a pronouncement *now* that the railways, road firms and canals would never revert to private ownership and control again. Unless and until that pronouncement is made, there will be no effective national planning. Only so can the danger be avoided of the industry being more concerned about its post-war status and condition as separate private concerns than it will be about building itself now into a coordinated system.

There is a great need for a speedy decision in this matter. The time of stress for the transport industry is the winter. During the summer, with the greater number of daylight hours, the industry can more readily fulfil the demands that war conditions bring. As the hours of black-out lengthen, transport difficulties increase. It is imperative, before winter comes, that the fullest measure of planning should be carried out. With a better national system most of the transport inconveniences and delays of the last two winters could be prevented.

I believe the House of Commons, in view of war needs, would readily accept the proposal to coordinate and unify transport under a single authority. I trust the new Minister will initiate this important constructive change early, and will, by the appointment of a National Transport Board, organise our transport for the purpose of enabling it to make its maximum contribution to the nation's war effort.

SAVING AND SPENDING

Fabius

The supply of food and consumer's goods is certain to deteriorate further during the next twelve months. The losses of the Battle of the Atlantic, though perhaps so far rather smaller than most people had feared, are progressively reducing our capacity to import food and raw materials in the future, and in any case an increasing proportion of our shipping space will be required for the transport of war material. During the next year, moreover, there will be a considerable further diversion of labour and materials away from civil goods to the armed forces and to the production of war equipment ; in the next few months, 750,000 more workers will be needed for the munition factories, and that must have marked repercussions upon civil output. Stocks of semi-finished and finished consumer's goods are being exhausted, and can be replaced only from heavily cut production. If the supply of goods for civil needs does not fall markedly between now and the middle of 1942, something will be seriously wrong ; that would be the clearest sign, indeed, that we were not really trying to win the war in the quickest possible time. The relatively high level of consumption now, compared with what we might have expected in the twenty-second month of the war, shows rather ominously how time was wasted in the first nine months of the war and how time has not been thoroughly mobilised since.

EQUITY IN DISTRIBUTION

There is no reason whatever why anyone should be seriously concerned by this downward trend in civil supply ; it is part and parcel of the war effort, and is a practical indication of the fact that we are pulling our weight. But the development of shortage will raise in ever-acuter form a number of problems which are already becoming serious. The central problem is simply this. How can we be sure that the reduced supply of goods (and services) will be distributed fairly among the public ? Our experience so far is that a great many difficulties exist ; it is apparently very difficult to get efficient regional distribution ; it is even more difficult to protect the factory worker from the person who has the time to spare to go round the shops buying up the scarce goods. The difficulty of price is very plain ; if prices are fixed, the goods disappear ; if no prices are fixed, then the price rises in extremely inflationary fashion ;

if rationing is introduced, it is apparently difficult to arrange for an equitable ration. Side by side with these problems of distribution are the problems of effective policing of the food and consumer's goods trades ; it is apparent to everyone that the mere announcement of a ration does not automatically ensure that no one buys more than his ration, nor does the fixing of a price ensure that all transactions actually take place at that price. From the point of view of public morale, it is vitally necessary that these problems should be tackled with urgency and dispatch ; no one minds very much if goods are short, but everyone objects with great vigour if the scarce supplies are unfairly distributed. The Government must act on a number of fronts, and must act decisively and determinedly.

RATIONING AND PRICE FIXING

There are two main lines of approach. The first is by rationing coupled with the fixing (and the subsidisation) of the price of rationed goods. This is possible over a wide range of goods. Existing rationing schemes cover a fairly substantial sector of the food supply, they cover clothes and petrol, and will shortly cover coal, gas and electricity. Rationing might well be extended to further foods, and some system of needs test might be introduced for such consumer's goods as furniture, domestic ware and household linen. But it is manifestly impossible to ration everything ; the Kalecki plan for rationing total expenditure would present very grave administrative difficulties. There will in fact always be a considerable sector of public consumption which will be devoted to the purchase of unrationed goods, and which will represent a sufficiently important part of the worker's budget to present dangers to the general equilibrium if prices are allowed to rise unrestrainedly. Rationing is one line of approach and a good one, but it cannot do the whole job of equal distribution by itself. That seems fairly certain, and incidentally it may be added that even on the present scale of rationing the police difficulties are considerable.

TAXATION AND SAVING

The other line of approach is financial. The kernel of the financial situation is that people's incomes are higher than they were before the war, while the output of consumer's goods is much less, and so the pressure upon prices develops. If a sufficiently large proportion of these incomes can be drained away before they are spent, then the spendable income may be kept more or less in step with the reduction in the amount of consumer's goods and services which are available to be bought. At bottom, this is the case for

heavy taxation. But it is outside practical politics to increase taxation to the necessary extent. Already, although taxation covers less than one half of total government spending, it is very easy to make a convincing case that taxation cannot be carried much farther. The combination of 10/- in the £ income tax and 100% E P T has certainly removed the most powerful single motive for industrialists to maximise the efficiency of their undertakings; the incidence of income tax upon the earnings of the better-paid key workers tends to reduce their willingness to work to the limit of their capacity. Some sections of the community are probably inadequately taxed—the 'stable profit' companies which made large profits before the war and so have only an insignificant liability to E P T are obvious examples—but the possible extent of further taxation is certainly limited. It cannot conceivably fill the gap between spendable incomes and the supply of consumer's goods. To fill this gap, we have to rely upon draining away people's incomes with voluntary savings. That is the real function of the National Savings Campaign—to sterilise people's incomes and so prevent them from flowing into the inflationary whirlpool. It would be much tidier admittedly to deduct a certain part of everyone's income at source by taxation or compulsory savings, but as that is impossible in practice because of its effects upon the very important money incentive (for all sections of the community), we have to do the best we can with voluntary savings. Together with rationing, the National Savings Campaign is the main weapon which the Government has at its disposal to fight inflation.

In these circumstances it is rather surprising that so little public attention is paid to the methods and policies carried out by the National Savings Campaign. This year, according to Sir Kingsley Wood's estimates, the Government hopes to bring personal savings up to a level nearly one half of that of the total receipts from taxation—an increase in the current year of between £200 and £300 millions, compared with total pre-war personal saving of no more than £150 millions. This is obviously a prodigious task, of the very first importance in the struggle against inflation. Yet very little governmental effort appears to be exerted in this job, the great bulk of the organisation is done by voluntary workers from Lord Kindersley downward, and Parliament seems to pay very little attention to it. On any objective analysis, much of the work done in the War-Weapons Weeks is undoubtedly wasted, and even the basic principles of the campaign are imperfectly understood. It must be emphasised day in and day out that the real purpose of voluntary savings is to adjust spendable incomes to the diminished supply of consumer's goods, or in other words to prevent people from increasing

the inflationary pressure by bidding up the prices of consumer goods and exhausting the stocks.

SAVING WITHOUT TEARS

The popular idea, unfortunately propagated by the National Savings Campaign itself, that the object of voluntary savings is to 'help pay for the war', in the sense that the Government needs the cash, is highly misleading, for the Government can get all the *money* it needs simply by borrowing from the Bank of England and the joint stock banks without the slightest difficulty (and at a far lower rate of interest). If I have a bank deposit of £100, on which I receive interest at the rate of ten shillings a year, withdraw it and buy 3% Defence Bonds yielding me £3 a year, the war effort gains precisely nothing; certainly I am not the loser, for I have multiplied my income sixfold. The bank lent my money to the Government at a much lower rate of interest than the Government pays me. Exactly the same consideration applies to the widow who has kept her money in a sock and is persuaded to buy National Savings Certificates; she gains, for she received interest on her money (which might have been bombed to bits) where previously she received none, but there is no conceivable gain to the nation. The only thing that helps the war effort is saving which represents a reduction in the money which the citizen intends to spend: that is the saving which the National Savings Campaign must stimulate. There is no point whatever in running the campaign unless it achieves that.

WEAPONS WEEK WOOLLINESS

According to this realistic criterion, the National Savings Campaign has not achieved nearly enough. A great deal of solid work has been done up and down the country organising savings groups. But it can hardly be denied that much of the propaganda has fallen very wide of the mark and is indeed positively misleading to the public. Appeals to people to convert their bank deposits into Defence Bonds and so make their 'idle' money work to help the war effort; appeals to company directors to invest their companies' resources in government securities; War Weapons Weeks in which great publicity was given to 'contributions' by insurance companies (which mean nothing at all, for the insurance companies will automatically invest their premium income in government securities, these being the normal securities in which insurance companies do invest)—such propaganda confuses the public and hinders the real work of voluntary savings. 'What's the good of my half crown a week when the Prudential buys two millions?'

is a common question, and it can be answered only by concentration on the *real* things and not the *money*, which is in fact simply a red herring. There is now some slight improvement in the Savings Campaign's advertising, but a much more definite lead against spending is most urgently required.

SIXTH COLUMN

The propaganda possibilities are endless if only they are handled with the imaginative vigour which enabled advertisers to fill the British public with dread of being offensive to their friends with B.O. and of losing their jobs because of night-starvation, and with shame for having window-curtains of less than perfect whiteness. The people who scour the shops for unrationed goods, the people who allow their tradesmen to give them more than the proper ration, the trailers from restaurant to restaurant, those who stand in queues because of rumours that 'there will be oranges at 3 o'clock', the people who drive round the countryside at weekends, the people who drive to work when they could use public transport—such people could be pilloried remorselessly and could be contrasted with the patriotic saver. Such folk are the Sixth Column, more insidious than any Nazi agent, and the only real power against them is the power of public opinion, mobilised by propaganda. If the Savings Campaign is to play its proper part in the struggle against inflation, then its propaganda must aim at building a public opinion which sees spending as sin. The latest advertisements chide people for spending; real results will not be seen until the campaign is run with a power and determination which no one will be able to ignore and still remain part of the community.

A GAP IN WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION

To and From the Place of Work

Professor Hermann Levy

A question put by Mr. Dobbie to the Minister of Pensions in the House of Commons on May 1st¹ has revealed the fact that persons engaged in civil defence work are not covered against injuries which may occur to them while travelling from their homes to their place of work and back. A case was mentioned of a widow who had made an application for a pension as her husband, a full-time paid Air Raid Warden, had been killed by a first-aid-service vehicle while he was on his way to report for his turn of duty; the accident happened ten minutes before his duty was due to begin, at 9.50 p.m. The application was refused. The Minister of Pensions declared this was in accordance with an agreement reached between the T U C and the Employers' Federation that the compensation scheme for persons engaged on such work should coincide as far as possible with Workmen's Compensation law.

THE SIZE OF THE PROBLEM

When this agreement was reached it was apparently overlooked that a great number of accidents happen every year to workers on the way to and from their place of work. Unfortunately such cases are not covered by British Workmen's Compensation law as the provision 'arising out of and in the course of employment' is strictly defined as being limited to injuries during work as such, so that coverage does not generally begin until the employee has started work. Accordingly accidents occurring to workers 'on the way' are not recorded by H.M. Inspectors of Factories or Mines. But the figures in Germany where such accidents are covered by industrial accidents insurance give an idea of what they may amount to in an industrial country. According to official statistics² there were in 1936 in Germany 87,627 cases of accidents to workers travelling to or from their place of work, representing 5.74% of all reported cases of industrial injury. The percentage would, however, amount to as much as 6.81% for industrial workers only, as cases

¹ Cf. H C Debates, Vol. 371, No 56. 1 May 1941, col. 543-5.

² *Ämtliche Nachrichten fuer Reichsversicherung*, 25 Dec. 1937, pp. 456-7.

relating to agricultural workers are much smaller. Out of 1,000 cases of fatal injuries compensated, 64 related to accidents on the way to work (*Wege-Unfaelle*). But out of 1,000 so-called 'way-to-work accidents' where compensation was paid,¹ 119 were fatal. It is not insignificant that with greater pressure of work since 1933 the percentage of 'way-to-work accidents' relative to the total number of accidents compensated has greatly increased, i.e. from 3.5% in 1933 to 5.3% in 1936. In 1936 the number of fatal 'way-to-work accidents' for which compensation was paid showed an increase of 23.93% over 1935.

From these figures the gravity of the problem becomes evident. It can hardly be less in England than in any other country. But it must be assumed that war conditions have greatly added to the risks which the worker encounters in this respect. The Ministry of Transport has announced that during April 726 people died as a result of road accidents, compared with 451 in April last year. There can be no doubt that accident proneness as well as non-subjective factors leading to such accidents have enormously increased since the war began, owing to the black-out, to greater fatigue and absent-mindedness, to nightwork, and to the dislocation of homes by the Blitz and greater distance of travel.

EMPLOYER'S TRANSPORT

In the Debate of May 1st, it was suggested by Mr. Shinwell that 'when this scheme was devised those responsible did not envisage' cases resulting from travelling to and from the place of work. But it must be stated with regret that even those who drafted the Memorandum of the T U C to the Royal Commission on Workmen's Compensation have apparently not understood the full importance of including all 'way-to-work accidents' in Workmen's Compensation. It was there merely suggested that²

an accident to a workman should be deemed to arise in connection with his employment if it occurs while the workman is travelling to or from his place of work in, or is waiting for, any means of transport directly or indirectly provided by his employer, whether the workman pays for travelling therein or not.

It is true that the most tragic cases in the past have been those

¹ It must be observed that the great majority of the cases reported are of a more trivial kind; the injured workers get sickness benefit for such cases under the German health insurance scheme; the number of new cases of 'way-to-work accidents' where compensation was paid by the industrial accident insurance scheme were in 1936 4,596. On the other hand, the official German publication notes that statistically 'way-to-work accidents are more serious in their results than all other accidents'.

² T U C *Workmen's Compensation*, Memorandum of Evidence submitted to the Royal Commission, reprint, pp. 4-5.

where workers who received injuries while on the way had been travelling by such means of transport. Of the many relevant cases the following may be mentioned.¹ A fruit picker was injured by the overturning of her employer's lorry which, driven by the employer's son, was taking the applicant to her work. The arbitrator found that this mode of conveyance was a convenience and might even be said to be the only one which was reasonably practical in the circumstances. It was proved that the applicant would not have taken the employment except on the condition that the employer undertook to provide the conveyance, but the arbitrator said there was no material upon which it could be held that the applicant was contractually bound to use the vehicle or was directed to use it. The Court of Sessions decided by a majority that the arbitrator was entitled to hold that the accident did not arise out of or in the course of employment.²

INTERNATIONAL COMPARISON

While such cases may be considered as particularly hard, to alter the law only in this respect would be to take a very narrow and mild view of the whole matter. Common sense must suggest that actually the employment, though not necessarily the payment, of the worker begins when he leaves his home for his place of work and ends when he returns home from work. It is merely a narrow and sophisticated terminology of 'employment' which would justify the present position that work begins only when the worker is actually 'working' and that it ends when he has left his machine.

A great many countries have long since adopted the view that the worker must be compensated for injuries received 'on the way' to or from work. The best continental compensation laws—viewed from the worker's angle—cover this risk.

The phrase 'in the course and out of' is characteristic of English industrial accident insurance. With other systems it is the establishment or plant which has to be insured against industrial accidents and it is evident that this means a substantial broadening of the responsibility. If under this system a worker is struck for instance by lightning while in the establishment, he is covered without any consideration as to whether this accident was closely connected with the work he was performing. If he meets with an accident while resting or having a meal in the factory such accident is not considered as unconnected with his employment with the only exception that he must not have disassociated himself from the

¹ *Craw v. Forrest*, 1931, S C 634; 1931, S L T 443; 24, B W C C Suppt. 67.

² Willis, *Workmen's Compensation*, 1936, pp. 24-5.

establishment (resting, for instance, outside the precincts of the factory). The underlying idea is that the injury might not have occurred to him should he have been within the precincts of the establishment. Defining industrial injuries like this has necessitated that 'on the way to work' cases had to be dealt with separately. Under the workmen's compensation law of Switzerland there is a distinction between Establishment-accidents and non-Establishment accidents¹; in the latter are included injuries received while travelling to and from the place of work, which are fully covered by the insurance. In the German law a special paragraph secures coverage in such cases which says (paragraph 545a of the *Reichsversicherungsordnung*):

Travelling to and from the place of work so far as it is connected with the employment in the respective establishment is to be considered as an occupation within the insured establishment.

In Sweden :

Industrial Accidents are deemed to include accidents during the journey to or from the place of work, where the journey is occasioned by or immediately connected with the employment.

Other countries with similar regulations are : Czechoslovakia, Austria, Poland, Yugoslavia and Finland. The war may well give an opportunity of amending the present law in England. It should be taken into account that inclusion of this risk in the present law would possibly induce employers or insurance offices to take special steps to reduce the risk of such accidents by safeguarding as much as possible the journey of the worker to and from work. A bill with the object of including 'travelling to and from work' within the meaning of 'in the course and out of employment' would not be a complicated matter. There are, of course, certain particular points to be envisaged beforehand in order to avoid the constant litigation which, unfortunately, arises from the interpretation of 'in the course and out of'. The connection between journey and employment must be strictly defined; the 'way home' must be clearly limited, particularly in respect of possible 'détours' and interruptions which the worker may choose; so must be the meaning of 'home' (for workers living in tenement houses, for instance, should reaching home mean the door of the flat or the main entrance of the building etc.?). In all such matters the experience of foreign countries and their legal arrangements will greatly facilitate the drafting of a bill, which should during the war be introduced to cover what is in fact one of the principal sectional reforms needed in British Workmen's Compensation laws.

49* ¹ *Betriebsunfaelle* and *Nicht-Betriebsunfaelle*, see article 67 of *Bundesgesetz* of 1911.

POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION AND THE PRESS

R. S. R. Fitter

Nobody would suggest that the Press is at present so well organised that it cannot be improved in the reconstruction of Britain that lies ahead, but no aspect of post-war reconstruction has been more neglected. This is largely because the Press presents quite the most ticklish problem of any industry. It is more than an industry, for a free press is one of the foundation-stones of democracy, yet it is as an industry that the problem of its place in our political and economic structure after the war must be tackled. The aim of this brief article is to pose a few fundamental questions which must be answered before any useful discussion can take place on the future of the Press, not only of the national dailies, but also of the provincial dailies and weeklies.

To start with, two basic assumptions may be made: (1) that the freedom of the Press to criticise the Government, short of actual sabotage, must at all costs be maintained; this precludes any regulations as to what, apart from defence matters, is, or is not, in the public interest, and hence may not be discussed in the Press; and (2) that the Press must as far as possible be freed from the exercise of undue influence by irresponsible private individuals and sectional interests, including advertisers.

OWNERSHIP AND CONTROL

Who should own and/or control the Press? This is a crucial question, which must be settled before anything else can usefully be discussed. The British newspaper press is at present run entirely on an unrestricted capitalist basis. The only partial exceptions to this rule are *The Times*, the *Daily Herald* and *Reynolds News*. *The Times* has a trust, consisting of the Lord Chief Justice, the President of the Royal Society, the Governor of the Bank of England, the Warden of All Souls' College, Oxford, and the President of the Institute of Chartered Accountants, with power to decide whether any prospective purchaser of the shares of The Times Holding Co. Ltd., which controls the Times Publishing Co. Ltd., is a fit and proper person to hold the shares, having regard to the importance of maintaining the best tradition and political independence of *The*

Times, and eliminating as far as reasonably possible questions of personal ambition or personal profit. In the case of the *Daily Herald* 49% of its shares are owned by the General Council of the Trades Union Congress and the remainder by Odhams Press Ltd. It is provided, however, that the policy of the *Daily Herald* in political matters shall be that of the Annual Conference of the Labour Party, and in industrial matters that of the General Council of the T U C. *Reynolds News* is the organ of the Cooperative Movement.

The problem of who should own or control the Press in post-war Britain must be considered in the light of the shortcomings of the capitalist system of ownership in the inter-war years and of the possible resistance of a capitalist-controlled Press to the programme of a Socialist Government. The possible alternative methods of controlling the Press, or of any individual newspaper, that is to say of exercising the right of appointing and dismissing the editor and hence of controlling policy, appear to be the following :

(1) **The State.** There may possibly be a case for the State owning one newspaper, but there can be none, in a democracy, for it owning or controlling the whole Press.

(2) **A Public Corporation.** The same argument applies as for the State. It could only be disastrous for a single public corporation, on the lines of the B B C or the Electricity Commissioners, to control the whole Press, and it would be equally undesirable for the whole Press to be in the hands of a series of such corporations, but there is a case for one or two individual public corporations owning individual newspapers.

(3) **The Workers in the Industry.** The idea that the journalists and/or printers should control the whole Press can be dismissed as one of the less practical ideas of the extreme type of guild socialism, but here again there is no reason why journalists and/or printers should not start or take over a single newspaper as a producers' cooperative effort.

(4) **The Readers.** In practice the readers already determine newspaper policy to some extent by buying the papers whose policy they approve, but proposals have been made to form a consumers' cooperative of the readers of each newspaper, each reader taking up a share of, say 1/-. The *Daily Worker* was supported by readers' subscriptions, but this did not apparently entitle them to a say in policy. The difficulties of a genuine cooperative scheme would be (a) how to get a sufficient number of readers to take an interest in the policy side and to prevent meetings being packed ; (b) if journalists were allowed to stand for the board of directors, the star writers would almost certainly be elected ,

with possibly undesirable results; and (c) how could existing newspapers be converted on to this basis?

(5) **Trustees.** The suggestion here is that the power of appointing and dismissing the editor should be vested in trustees, representing the chief regional and functional interests concerned with the newspaper. This would appear to be an admirable idea for provincial papers, whose boards of trustees might consist of representatives of the local authorities, chamber of commerce, university, trades council, churches and so on. The *Bristol Evening Post* provides an interesting precedent. Under the agreement which followed the Bristol 'newspaper war,' five of the seven directors of Bristol Evening Post Ltd. had to be Bristolians. It is more difficult, however, to see how the trustee idea would work out for the London national papers. Who, for instance, would make suitable trustees for such papers as the *Daily Mirror* or the *Daily Mail*?

(6) **The Shareholders.** If the Press continues on a capitalist basis, control will, of course, continue to rest with the shareholders. Some of the present abuses arising from the dictatorial control of a single proprietor might be avoided if a restriction could be placed on individual or family shareholdings, say 10%. It would by no means be easy to devise such a law, but if it could be done it would provide one of the best solutions of the problem of the ownership and control of the Press.

(7) The actual solution is likely to be found in a combination of two or more of the above alternatives—the Press is the last sphere in which totalitarianism can be countenanced—but those discussed under (5) and (6) appear to provide the most promising lines of advance.

FINANCE AND ADVERTISING

The other outstanding problem about the Press is how it is to be financed. The salient point about the present situation is, of course, the fact that sales revenue covers only about half the cost of production, leaving the balance and any profits to be derived from advertising revenue. This puts advertisers in a position to exercise an undesirable influence over editorial policy, in so far as it concerns their products. As the P E P *Report on the British Press* says:

It is particularly in the sphere of health education that advertising interests—baby foods, patent medicines, dentifrices, tobacco, intoxicating liquors, white bread, meat extracts—embarrass and hamper the Press in performing a function which would be a real national benefit.

The problem is how to prevent the dependence of newspapers and periodicals on advertising revenue enabling the advertisers to exercise such an influence detrimental to the public interest.

A possible solution would be to cut out advertising revenue altogether. This, however, would be cutting of the Press's nose to spite its face. It would involve either raising the price of newspapers to the public, a retrograde step in days when abundant supplies of cheap and reliable news are one of the fundamental needs of a democratic state, or subsidising the Press in some other way. In France and other Continental countries the Press was subsidised 'in some other way.' We do not want to see British newspapers maintained out of the secret service funds of our own or any other Government. It is well to remember that it is from precisely this danger that newspaper advertising has delivered us. At the beginning of the 19th century practically every British newspaper had surreptitious sources of funds, and *The Times* made its name for independence by refusing to accept Government money.

We return, therefore, to advertising. There is no basic moral, political or economic reason why newspapers and periodicals should not sell space for publicity. Indeed, in a modern civilised society, where publicity has become an essential, there is much to be said for canalising it into a channel where it does not disfigure the countryside, as with hoardings, or the heavens, as with sky-writing. While advertising itself is a largely beneficent function—it is arguable, for example, that advertising has done more than anything else to raise public standards of personal hygiene in the past half-century—the advertising industry contains an unduly large number of black spots. It is still in the klondyke stage of development, and is perhaps more vigorously competitive than any other British industry.

A Royal Commission ?

There is a very good case for a thorough investigation into the affairs and practices of the advertising industry, and this could only be done satisfactorily by a Royal Commission, with full power to subpoena witnesses and require the disclosure of documents. Such an inquiry would probably uncover many unsavoury practices and show the need for a thorough clean-up in the interests of both the advertisers themselves and the public. Only after public opinion had been prepared in this way could any satisfactory reforms in the relations between advertisers and the Press be introduced.

Such reforms, it must be emphasised, as are considered here are concerned with the influence of advertisers over the Press, which the P E P report described as :

a tendency to tone down or suppress minor items of news or features if they seem likely to annoy advertisers or potential advertisers, and an even more serious tendency to prevent problems, emphasis on which would be inconvenient to advertisers, from securing widespread discussion if possible.

There is another quite distinct problem with which this one is apt to be confused, that of eliminating false, misleading and anti-social advertisements. This needs to be tackled along the lines of enforcing standards by law and within the industry itself, and of educating the public to discriminate between genuine and misleading advertisements.

A Central Association or Pool?

To return to the problem of advertisers' influence over the Press, the root of the matter lies in the allocation of advertisements. It is the advertiser's power to threaten 'If I dislike what appears in your paper, I shall take my advertisement away and so reduce your income,' that constitutes his whip-hand. If the advertising industry had a central organ, with powers similar to those exercised by the Newspaper Proprietors' Association over the London dailies, a solution of the problem might be to empower this body to examine advertising appropriations; to call for explanations if any newspapers which should have advertisements on the basis of their circulations and readership have not been included, and to make public any proved case of bias. Newspaper managements would have access to this body, and their complaints about unfair treatment, if substantiated, would have to be met, probably by a compensation levy.

Another interesting possibility would be to concentrate or federate all advertising agents into an Advertising Central Office. This Central Office would operate a series of pools into which all revenue in respect of advertisements in the journals belonging to each pool should be paid. Thus there would be pools for the national morning, provincial morning, all evening, all Sunday and all weekly newspapers, also for various kinds of periodicals. The contents of each pool would be distributed among the members of the pool, not according to the amount of advertising they carried during the given period, but according to an impartial estimate of their 'advertising value,' based on an annual market research survey of the readership of all newspapers and periodicals. This device would not sever the present links between advertisers and their media, because advertisers would still be perfectly free to place advertisements where they liked and newspapers to reject advertisements they did not like. What it would do would be to remove the power of an advertiser to fine a newspaper by threatening not

to advertise. Existing space-rates and so forth would continue, unless varied by the Central Advertising Office. If the value of a newspaper as an advertising medium were to rise or decline, this would be reflected in the market research survey, and the paper's quota adjusted accordingly. The market research survey would be carried out by the Central Advertising Office, and would, of course, have to be very thorough, and much more detailed than that of the Incorporated Society of British Advertisers in 1936, but if this purely technical obstacle could be surmounted, there seems to be a strong case for further investigation of this scheme. From the purely financial point of view, it would have the advantage of eliminating a great many of the backstairs practices for which advertising is notorious.

NOTES ON BOOKS

Home Affairs

THE LESSON OF LONDON by Ritchie Calder. (Secker and Warburg 2/-)

A clear and straightforward account of the autumn raids on London, and their consequences. He describes without mercy all the official and unofficial incompetence and lack of initiative, much as he did at the time in the *Daily Herald*. He draws the moral with great ruthlessness. But perhaps the biggest difficulty was that nobody really knew what air raids would be like, though that was no excuse for the slowness with which the 'lesson' was learnt after the event. Calder exposes the inadequacy of our local government with Shavian thoroughness, but his scheme of reforms is vague. D.B.

THE GROWTH OF THE BRITISH CIVIL SERVICE by Emmeline W. Cohen (Allen & Unwin 10/6)

A good straightforward factual history of the Civil Service from 1780 to the present day, well-documented and careful. Rather uncritical in its approach, with not very much attention to the essential forces which were moulding British economic and political life during the period; likewise no attempt is made to assess the extent to which the present Civil Service is in fact adequate for present administrative needs. But within the limits which Miss Cohen has set for herself, the book does a job which is worth doing. R. W. B. C.

MUNICIPAL TRADING by Herman Finer (Allen & Unwin 16/-)

Water, electricity, gas and transport are the main trading services discussed in a comprehensive survey which includes the historical, financial, administrative, statistical and legal aspects. Difficulties—both inherent and obstructive—over a period of years are clearly reviewed; the book is fully referenced throughout with meticulous care. The author displays an intimate personal experience in Local Government generally, which is reflected in a section of especial interest to Labour Councillors and members of Joint Boards on the relative duties of staff and committees and the correct relationship between their respective functions, without which public administration can never be effective. H. F.

THE POLITICS OF FOOD by George Darling (Routledge 5/-, L B S 2/6)

An interesting and well-documented discussion of war and post-war food problems, Mr Darling, whilst giving praise where praise is due, has analysed clearly the main defects of policy; failure to produce a proper nutrition policy before 1939; inadequate preparation for war; the delayed introduction of rationing (a Cabinet decision *against* the advice of the Ministry of Food), and reluctance to extend it sufficiently rapidly; the obstructive attitude of a Ministry of Agriculture concerning itself mainly with farmers' interests; excessive tenderness to vested interests in the distributive trades. The book contains an excellent description of the organisation of the food trades and of the merits and defects (which Mr Darling does not minimise) of the Co-operative movement.

The last two chapters form one of the best and most realistic discussions of the post-war food problem which I have seen. N. B.

WOMEN AT WORK by Mary Agnes Hamilton (Routledge 5/-, L B S 2/6)

At a time when once more the importance of women in industry is growing it is fitting that this book should appear to remind us of the struggle of the early days not only of women in industry but of the whole Trade Union movement. Mrs Hamilton writes with spirit and this is no dry chronicle of facts and events but especially in the first part arouses one's admiration by its fire. The present generation of young women could learn much from it. A. M.

THE WAY TO JUSTICE by H. L. Hart, KC (Allen & Unwin, 5/-)

A valuable guide to law reform. In 130 pages he covers nearly the whole of English law and almost every page contains a provocative and drastic proposal for reform. He makes suggestions for simplifying the law and making it comprehensible by everyone, for cheapening litigation and for a Ministry of Justice. This last proposal—which was recommended by a Government Committee in 1918—is perhaps the most important. Law Reform is delayed because it is not the duty of any Government Department to promote it. All that Mr Hart says will not be accepted by socialists. Some of his proposals assume that the present economic system is eternal. None the less his book should be read and discussed as widely as possible. I hope that it will do something to dispel ignorance and apathy about law and stimulate a demand for reform. R. S. W. P.

CONSCIENCE AND LIBERTY By R. S. W. Pollard (Allen & Unwin 2/6)

A timely plea for freedom of conscience. The author considers the case of the conscientious objector, showing some humanisation in the present attitude towards him as compared with 25 years ago, but the political objector is still apparently denied a conscience. The book illustrates clearly many ways in which our liberties are curtailed; it is especially interesting to those who are concerned with the survival after the war of the freedom for which we fight today.

O. R. C.

MIGRATION TO AND FROM THE BRITISH ISLES by R. S. Walshaw (Jonathan Cape 5/-)

A concise summary, with explanation and comment, of our migration statistics, mostly dealing with the last 20 years. Reveals the remarkable reversal of population movement since the slump, and analyses the causes and effects of this change. D. B.

THE ENGLISH AT WAR by Cassandra (Searchlight Books 2/-)

THE FORWARD MARCH by Sir Richard Acland (Allen & Unwin 2/6)

CHOOSE YOUR FUTURE by D. N. Pritt (Lawrence & Wishart 2/6)

MR. CHURCHILL'S SOCIALISTS by Michael MacAlpin (Lawrence & Wishart 3/6)

THE NEW ORDER by C. B. Purdom (Dent 7/6)

These publications look like books, but, except perhaps the last, they are all certainly pamphlets—parts of the warfare of words that is now going on. Cassandra of the *Daily Mirror*, in a state of violent indignation attacks the Churches, the Army High Command, the unequal distribution of property, and the failure to state war aims. Heart is in the right place, but not much fresh to say.

Sir Richard Acland, in a well-written, simple and transparently sincere little product, urges that we should take steps now to establish Common Ownership, and so make a country worth fighting for. He wastes a certain amount of space trying to prove that his Common Ownership is not Socialism (which it is) because of a mistaken belief that Socialism allows the existence of no other motive than the economic. His immediate measures, which he thinks the conversion of a very few keen people would be sufficient to bring about, include evolution of rent, nationalisation of all principal industries with compensation deferred to the end of the war, and establishment of national standard of living, including scaling down of war-work earnings. Worth reading, especially by non-Socialists.

Mr. Purdom leaves one gasping. Here is a complete blue-print for reorganising, on a basis of 'function', the whole world, by means of guilds and professional unions, economic, cultural and civic Congresses for regions, countries, colonies, dominions, the British Empire, Europe, U S A and the World; and no hint of how it is all to come about. There are 250 pages all crammed with detail; it is the most unrealistic production I have read since 1913.

Then follow two Communists. Mr. MacAlpin traces the melancholy British record over Spain, to U.S.S.R., etc., blames the Labour leaders as freely as Chamberlain for them, and puts his faith in the People's Convention. The selection of facts is biased, naturally; but they are facts none the less, and should not be forgotten, however unpleasantly they read. Mr. Pritt also puts his faith in the People's Convention; he argues that the war is spreading, that this country is becoming Fascist, and that nothing but a people's revolution can stop it. This pamphlet does not add much to what he has said in his earlier writings, except for a comment on the 'rather unamiable or even ridiculous characteristics of Italian and German Fascists'. The preface says that the author detests Hitler.

M. I. C.

ADVISORY BODIES ed. by R. V. Vernon and N. Mansergh (Allen & Unwin 18/-)

There are far too few books on the structure and organisation of administration. This investigation by the Oxford University Politics Research Committee fills the gap in many ways. The authors have not refrained from scrutinising in detail, and with much criticism, the working of the most important bodies advising individual departments of the State. The book shows that advisory bodies in this country still deserve high praise; less praise may be due to the way the State has, of late, in many cases, made use of the recommendations of such bodies. It would have been useful if the authors had, even more than they do, tried to elucidate the deeper causes of this deficiency. They would also have been well advised to go more critically into the composition of committees, the selection of witnesses and into the 'scope of enquiry' which in many instances appears to be too narrow. We also miss a statement about the growing tendency to restrict the publicity of the findings to the publication of the Report while the evidence remains unpublished.

H. I.

International

HITLER'S NEW ORDER IN EUROPE by Paul Einzig (Macmillan 7/6)

A financial expert's review of the New Order. Good on the monetary aspect of German domination of Europe, weak on the political and social side. Lack of insight into the real character of Nazi aims is clearly shown for instance in the observations on agricultural questions. The author thinks that the motive behind the reversal of the land reform in Czechoslovakia was the need of speeding up agricultural production, instead of being, as it in fact was, the desire to reward the German aristocracy who sabotaged the Czech Republic. D. W.

THE REVOLUTION IS ON by M. W. Foder (Allen & Unwin 10/6)

Description of Flanders-and-France blitz, by an eye-witness, followed by an analysis of the Russian, German and Italian revolutions, showing their essential similarities both in cause and in results, and forecasting a further revolutionary cycle before stability can be reached. The description is good; the dissertation sensible but not particularly profound. R. W. B. C.

OIL AND THE WAR by E. M. Friedwald (Heinemann 3/6)

A useful, admirably objective little book by the former editor of *La Revue Pétrolifère*. Taking into account the vital factors of Russia's overworked railway system, Danube transport, and the problem of lubricating oil, he concludes that Germany's oil position was adequate (before the Balkan campaign) for a few months' Blitzkrieg only, providing our Navy holds the Eastern Mediterranean, or, alternatively, the Rumanian oilfields can eventually be destroyed. W. W. M.

I SAW IT HAPPEN IN NORWAY by Carl J. Hambro (Hodder & Stoughton 7/6)

The president of the Norwegian Parliament describes the German invasion of Norway, exposes the charges of 'trickery' against the Norwegian people, emphasises the constitutional standing of the Norwegian Government in Britain. Of documentary value, for M. Hambro is Number 2 to the King in Norway; and interesting in itself as a stirring story of a very democratic democracy fighting for its life. R. W. B. C.

ATLAS-HISTORY OF THE SECOND GREAT WAR by J. F. Horrabin Vol. 3 (Nelson 3/6)

This volume, covering the period July 1940 to February 1941, has not suffered from being drawn and written for the most part in air-raid shelters. The diagrams of economic resources etc. are as graphic as usual. W. W. M.

ESTONIA by J. Hampden Jackson (Allen & Unwin 8/6)

A valuable study of the development of one of the new small nations now again submerged. It will be interesting to see whether a people that has acquired such a strong national consciousness will remain part of the U.S.S.R. and if so on what terms. J. P.

CHINA IN PEACE AND WAR by Madame Chiang Kai-Shek (Hurst and Blackett 5/-)

A varied collection of her writings and speeches over the last five years. She gives a remarkable account of the aspirations and ideals of China, and the determination to modernise the industry and administration of the country, while seeking inspiration and guidance in ancient Chinese philosophy, and rejecting the modern 'isms' which have brought

mostly suffering to China. The second part of the book is a timely reminder that aggression is still going on in the Far East with even greater barbarity, if possible, than is shown by the Germans. D. B.

SOVIET PEACE POLICY by V. Molotov (Lawrence & Wishart Cloth 3/6 Paper 2/-)

These four speeches are a well argued presentation of the case for Soviet policy on the basis of Russian interests. The first is a defence of the Soviet-German Pact, on the now familiar lines. The second throws contempt on ideological war as a mediaeval concept. The third is a war speech, with Finnish atrocity stories, and the fourth is an explanation of the fall of France, on the lines that her chief fault was inability to take the Soviet Union seriously.

The speeches fully indicate the power and brilliance of Molotov's mind, even if they seem so similar in material and attitude to the type of nationalist speech more usual in the last war than this. D. W.

BRITISH STRATEGY—MILITARY AND ECONOMIC by Admiral Sir Herbert Richmond (Cambridge 3/6)

A survey, in nine wars, of the relative positions assigned by Britain to economic warfare, continental assistance to allies, and attacks upon communications. W. W. M.

FROM DUNKIRK TO BENGHAZI by Strategicus (Faber 10/6)

The second volume of a history of the war by a well-known military journalist. He stresses morale as the military factor outweighing 'machines, mass and momentum,' but his book would be more interesting if it showed more of the part played by the State and civil organisation in maintaining or threatening morale. The military history is good, but familiar, and it naturally lacks the fulness and vigour which will only be possible when key secrets can be revealed after the war.

W. W. M.

General

THE SOCIAL RELATIONS OF SCIENCE by J. G. Crowther (Macmillan 16/-)

A survey of the development of human thought from prehistoric times to the present, and of the interactions of science and social conditions. Different phases of the history are treated very unequally. But the whole gives a sense of the failure of mankind to use his one weapon, his intellect, for his own good. We may not accept Crowther's reasons for this failure; still less his belief that, in some circumstances, an inquisition may be justified and may benefit science. Good reason to study the history of science and the methods by which we can control its use. All the more so if, as Crowther believes, modern methods of production demand the limitation of individual freedom, and the fruits of science have made such limitation more easy. J. R. M.

MARXISM—IS IT SCIENCE ? by M. Eastman (Allen & Unwin 8/6)

An intelligent and important book. Attacks those who endeavour to make Marxism a religion and do not take into consideration altering conditions. Maintains that Marx's analysis is far from clear and that it is well nigh impossible to reconcile some of the contradictions in the various parts of *Capital*. A delightful chapter on Trotsky.

W. H. A.

